



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/498,525	02/04/2000	Hammam Elabd	73234	8921
27498	7590	02/02/2005	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP 2475 HANOVER STREET PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1114				VO, LILIAN
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2127		

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/498,525	ELABD, HAMMAM
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lilian Vo	2127

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address--

THE REPLY FILED 11/30/05 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE

Claim(s) objected to: NONE

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 10 - 14

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

10. Other: _____


 MENG-ALT AN
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
 Lilian Vo
 Examiner
 Art Unit: 2127

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection was deemed proper. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

1) With respect to applicant's remarks that the references fail to disclose a system having a "means for selecting two or more DSPs from a plurality of DSPs for processing the communication data" (page 7, 2nd paragraph) and "the parallel processing of communication data using two or more DSPs and the load management system..." (page 7, 3rd paragraph), the examiner disagrees. Chen discloses that "... digital signal processor 611, digital signal processor 613, digital signal processor 616, and digital signal processor 617 may operate in parallel to execute a plurality of modular multimedia software tasks" (col. 31, lines 26 - 33). In other words, operate in parallel means that executing using more than one DSP, such as selecting two or more DSPs for processing the communication data. Therefore, Chen clearly discloses the system with such capability and thus read on the claim limitation.

Furthermore, the recitation "parallel processing of communication data using two or more DSPs" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

2) In response to applicant's argument (page 7, 2nd paragraph) that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., applicant's figure 3b, which applicant's claimed invention does not incorporate this shared bus structure between the load management system 100 and the DSP array 12) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).